

**REMARKS**

Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1, 10-17, 22, 24-32, 34, and 41 are amended, leaving claims 2-9, 18-21, 23, 33, 35-40, 42, and 43 unchanged.

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the telephonic interview on November 14, 2007 mentioned above. In the telephonic interview, the terms "squeegee" and "squeegee member" were discussed in detail, as was the proposal by the Applicant's Representative to change all instances of "squeegee member" in the claims to "squeegee". Also, an agreement was reached between Examiner Patel and the Applicant's Representatives (Christopher B. Austin and Julianne M. Smith) that if the term "squeegee" in the pending claims was indicated as "at least partially defining a blade", and if the word "member" used in connection with the word "squeegee" was removed, the pending claims would more clearly define over the prior art of record.

On pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,823,427 issued to Gibbs et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,980,941 issued to Miller.

Claim 1 is hereby amended, and calls for:

A spill cleaning device comprising:

    a cleaning pad member;

    at least one squeegee at least partially defining a blade connected to said cleaning pad member and

    at least one sachet member connected to said cleaning pad member.

(Amendment marks not shown).

Claim 22 is also hereby amended, and calls for:

A spill cleaning device comprising:

    a cleaning pad member;

    at least two squeegees, each squeegee at least partially defining a blade connected to said cleaning pad member and

    at least one sachet member connected to said cleaning pad member.

(Amendment marks not shown).

Claim 34 is also hereby amended, and calls for:

A method of absorbing a spill on a surface and cleaning the surface with a single device comprising:

placing a cleaning pad member with at least one squeegee at least partially defining a blade and at least one sachet member on a surface with a spill;

moving the device toward the spill with the squeegee positioned forward to collect solid debris; and

collecting the liquid debris with the cleaning pad member.

(Amendment marks not shown).

In contrast, and as discussed with the Examiner in the November 14, 2007 telephonic Examiner's Interview, Gibbs discloses a dust mop head and head cover having a cleaning cloth 10 without any element or structure resembling a squeegee or performing the function of a squeegee, and without any element or structure resembling a blade or performing the function of a blade. As also discussed in the Examiner's Interview, the term "squeegee" is a well-known, well-recognized, and well-defined structure, and cannot reasonably be compared to any portion of a cleaning cloth such as that disclosed by Gibbs. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that Gibbs fails to teach, describe, or suggest, among other things, a spill cleaning device having a cleaning pad member connected to one or more squeegees and at least one sachet member as claimed in amended claims 1 and 22, or a method of absorbing a spill and cleaning a surface with a single device, in which a cleaning pad member with at least one squeegee and at least one sachet member is placed on a surface, is moved, and collects liquid debris as claimed in amended claim 34.

Miller fails to cure the deficiencies of Gibbs. Miller discloses a cleaning cloth having multiple layers, such as paper and capsules containing liquid, but also fails to teach, describe, or suggest, among other things, a spill cleaning device having a cleaning pad member connected to one or more squeegees and at least one sachet member as claimed in amended claims 1 and 22, or a method of absorbing a spill and cleaning a surface with a single device, in which a cleaning pad member with at least one squeegee and at least one sachet member is placed on a surface, is moved, and collects liquid debris as claimed in amended claim 34. Accordingly, Miller and Gibbs, alone or in combination, fail to disclose all of the claimed elements and features of amended claims 1, 22 and 34.

Response, Amendment, and Examiner's Interview Summary filed November 28, 2007  
Response to Office Action mailed on August 28, 2007  
Applicant Docket No. JD-326-US

For these and other reasons not discussed herein, the Applicant respectfully submits that amended claims 1, 22 and 34 are patentable over Gibbs and Miller. Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of claims 1, 22, and 34 is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 2-21, 23-33, and 35-43 each ultimately depend from amended independent claims 1, 22, and 34, respectively, and are therefore allowable based upon amended independent claims 1, 22, and 34 and upon other features and elements claimed in claims 2-21, 23-33 and 35-43 but not discussed herein. Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of claims 2-21, 23-33 and 35-43 is also therefore respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned Applicant's Representative if she believes discussion of this case would be helpful in advancing prosecution of the pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,



Gregory S. Bollis  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 52,630

JohnsonDiversey, Inc.  
8310 16<sup>th</sup> Street – M/S 509  
Sturtevant, WI 53177  
USA  
Phone: (262) 631-4593  
Fax: (262) 631-4021